

2

A
DISCOURSE
OCCASIONED BY
Mr. Boyse's Ordination Sermon,
ENTITULED,
The Office of a Scriptural Bishop:
WHEREIN THE
Presbyterian Notion of BISHOPS
Is shewn to be wholly
Unscriptural;
AND
That Form of Church-Government, which is now
call'd *Episcopal*, to have been by GOD's own
Appointment.

By *Edward Drury*, M. A. Cur. Assist. to *St. Andrew's, Dublin.*

Οἱ Διάκονοι τοῖς Πρεσβυτέροις ἀρχιερεύουσιν, οἱ Πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ Διάκονοι καὶ ὁ Λόγιος κηρύττει τὴν Ἐπισκοπὴν, καὶ ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος τὴν Χριστὸν ὡς ὁ Χεὶρ τοῦ Πατρὸς. *Ignatij Epist. ad Philadelph.*

D U B L I N:

Printed by *A. Rhamés*, at the *Three Keys* in *St. Nicholas's-street*, for
J. Hyde in *Dame's-street*, and are to be sold by the rest of the
Booksellers. MDCCIX.

DISCOURSE

ON THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE



OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

THE PREFACE.

IT is a Common, but, I'm afraid, too true an Observation, that Men bring their Opinions to the Holy-Scriptures, not to be Tried and Regulated by them, but to be Supported; and so they strive to pick out Something which may give Countenance to those Notions they have Imbibed, and which they are resolv'd to Maintain.

This is the Reason that they Collect such imperfect Portions of Scripture, which at first sight may seem to favour their Opinion, without having any regard to the Design of the Inspired Pen-Men, or their Coherence and Connexion with what went before or follows after: This is but too evident in most Books of Religious Controversies; thus the Socinians can easily overlook all the Texts of Scripture which positively declare the Divinity of Christ, while they Collect, in Vindication of their Opinion, those Places of Holy-Writ, which speak of our Saviour in his state of Humiliation; as he took our Nature upon him. Thus do the Romanists maintain the Pope's Supremacy, because St. Peter happen'd to be reckon'd first among the Apostles, and because Christ said unto him, upon this Rock will I build my Church, without ever attending to the Design of those Places, or considering that St. Paul withstood him to his Face, and declares himself not behind the very chiefest Apostles. Thus again they think, this is my Body, evidently makes for their Absurd Doctrine of Transubstantiation, without ever considering the Figurative and Spiritual Sense of those Words, and that the Apostle calls it Bread and Wine after the Consecration of the Elements.

The P R E F A C E.

And thus too do our Dissenting Brethren take Words for Things, in those Differences that are between Them, and the Church by Law Establish'd : I could mention a great many of their controverted Points, but that relating to Episcopacy shall suffice at present : Thus does J. B. muster up all those Texts of Scripture which seem to use the Words Bishop, and Presbyter promiscuously for one another, not considering that it is not the Name, but the Office which we Contend for ; and what is much more unaccountable, he wou'd perswade the World, that because the Words were used promiscuously, there was no Distinction in the Office, but that mere Presbyters were the Supreme Order of Consecrated Persons in the Church, tho' he owns that the Apostles were Superiour to them, and we have Prov'd that those whom we call Bishops were Successours to the Apostles.

All therefore that I shall desire of the Reader is, not to take up, either Mr. B's, or my Notions, upon Trust, but to examine them Impartially, and then judge as a Matter of so great Concern deserves : Let him but Read Attentively, and Practice Conscientiously, and then I don't doubt, but GOD will give him so much Light, as to discover the Path wherein he ought to Walk : But if Men are resolv'd to Read with Prejudice, and Judge with Partiality, the best Cause in the World must Miscarry ; and such Men are likely to continue in their Errours, and to walk in Darknes.

A
DISCOURSE

OCCASION'D

By Mr. B——'s Ordination
Sermon, &c.

IT might be justly look'd upon as a fruitless Labour, for any one to undertake the Defence of Presbitery at this time, when all the Pleas that ever were, or indeed can be brought for it, have been already so learnedly and convincingly Answer'd.

One wou'd think too, That it were needless to give Things of this Nature any other Answer, than to refer the Reader to Bp. Hall, Bp. Taylor, Bp. Downham, Bp. Pearson, to the Seventh Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, to Dr. Maurice's Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy, and his Vindication of the Primitive Church, and to Dr. Parker, and to many Others who have, with abundance of Learning, exhausted this Subject, and Answer'd all that the Presbyterians ever did, or can say for their Cause.

But however, Since Mr. B— has been pleas'd (for what reason I will not pretend to enquire) to Print a Sermon against Episcopacy (which he has taken out of *Smeectymnus*, and the Assembly of Divines, their *jus Divinum Ministerij Anglicani*) without taking any notice of the *Answers* which have been given to those Books out of which he has Borrowed his *Arguments*, and lest the People of this Kingdom, who have neither Inclination nor Opportunity of reading large Volumes upon this Subject; lest, I say, they should take Mr. B—'s Arguments for *Conclusive*, and think his Sermon *Unanswerable*, I have ventur'd (for their sakes) to Publish the following Discourse by way of Answer, and as an An-

A Discourse occasion'd by

tidote to his Sermon, that the World and his own People may see, that he is mistaken.

As for our parts, who are the Clergy of this Kingdom, we industriously avoided all Controversies of this Nature, and had no other Design than of living peaceably with our *Dissenting Brethren*; and I should scarcely have appear'd in Publick on this Subject, had not our Church and Bishops been thus unexpectedly Assaulted: One would have thought indeed, that all the Indulgence and Connivance, and Kindnesses which have been shewn to our *Dissenting Brethren*, would have had a quite different Effect and Return from them, then to make them abuse the Kindness and fly in the Face of their Superiours, and of those Laws which are connived at, in order to make our Dissenters easy: One would have thought that these mild Proceedings might have prevented their sending out *Missionaries* about the Country to disturb the Peace of the Church, and to preach up Faction and Division: It might have been expected at least, that it would have prevented their *Preaching* and *Writing* against the Order of Bishops.

But that this has been the Return that they have made for our Kindnesses, I need go no further for an Instance than Mr. B—'s Ordination Sermon just published, which he calls, *The Office of a Scriptural Bishop*, (but how truly shall appear hereafter.) He promised, indeed, in the Preface to his first Volume of Sermons, to manage this Controversy with that *Clearness* and *Temper*, that are genuine Characters of the *Wisdom* which is from Above; which is, first *Pure* then *Peaceable*: But I leave it to the Christian Reader to judge how he has observed those Characters either in his Sermon, or in that very *Preface* where he made so Christian a Profession: If he had kept to his Promise we should not have had so many undecent Reflections on Bishops and their Order; nay, on all who profess themselves Members of the Episcopal Communion: We should not then have had our Bishopricks branded with the odious Name of *Pompous Sine-Cures*, nor our Bishops mark'd out as *Unscriptural* and *Scandalous Non-Residents*: We should not then have had him insinuate that our Religion is *Corrupt*, for retaining and justifying that *Form* of Church-Government; nor its Members term'd *degenerate Protestants* and *Enemies to the Reformed Religion*: This seems to be no less than an uncharitable condemning of all the

Ordin. Sermon.
pag. 407.
Ordin. Sermon.
pag. 410.
Preface to the
4th. Vol. of
Sermon.

Mr. B---'s Ordination Sermon.

3

the Churches in the World for 1500 Years after Christ, of *Degeneracy* and *Corruption*, and an Exclusion of all who are not of their own Perswasion, from that *Purity* which is necessary to every good Christian; and I leave it once more to the World to judge, whether this be not very far from that *Modesty* and *peaceable Temper* which Mr. B— Boasts of; or whether it can ever agree with those genuine Characters of heavenly Wisdom, which he has laid down in his Preface, as a Rule to walk by.

Mr. B— tells us, “That if the *Bishoprick* the Apostle speaks
 “of be the same thing that too many apprehend it to be, Serm. pag. 406, 407.
 “who most vehemently aspire to it, *viz.* a Grand and
 “Pompous *Sine-Cure*, a *Domination* over all the Churches and
 “Ministers in a large District, managed by others as his
 “Delegates, but requiring little Labour of a Man’s own,
 “and all this supported by large *Revenues*, and attended
 “with considerable *Secular Honours*: He should despair of
 being able to vindicate the Truth of the Saying.

But I would ask Mr. B—, Who ever entertained this Notion of Episcopacy? and I desire the Reader to judge whether this be not a taxing our Church with what it was never guilty of? And then to consider, how it agrees with that *Purity* and *Peaceableness* which the Apostle lays down as the genuine Marks of heavenly Wisdom. He could not James 3. 17.
 but know that we never make those Temporal Dignities and Honours, which the Crown has been pleas’d to annex to every Bishoprick, any Ingredient in our Notion of the Order; for tho’ we say that it is not inconsistent for Bishops to be great Men, to bear Rule, and keep Temporal Courts, &c. Yet all this worldly Grandeur is not necessary to that Character: So that I cannot see what Design Mr. B— cou’d have in telling the World, that this is the Notion of a Bishoprick they entertain of it, who most vehemently aspire to it, unless it was to abuse his Auditory and Readers, and give them wrong Notions of our Constitution, in order to keep up the Division among them: Just such another Out-cry against our Church, as *Popery*, *Superstition*, &c. only to make us appear Monstrous to the People, and by that means to keep the People from hearkening unto us: And is just such another piece of Policy, as the Jews made use of against our Saviour, when they ascribed his Miracles to *Beelzebub*, and would make him a Wine-Bibber and a Glutton, &c. only to

A Discourse occasioned by

set the People against him; nay what is more strange, we find there were some then who *gave Credit* to their Accusation.

I hope I shall avoid what I so justly Blame in Mr. B—: I have given Him and his Cause, all the Concessions he could reasonably ask, and therefore if at any time I seem to Expose him, I would desire the Reader to impute it to the *Weakness* of Mr. B—'s Cause: For thus it always did, and must happen to all Men who will undertake to defend a Cause, which cannot, will not be defended: Thus it happened to the great *Grotius* upon this very Occasion, for while he was endeavouring to defend *Presbytery*, he was forced to Argue *against it*, and to *establish Episcopacy* to all Intents and Purposes, as any one may see, that will read his Book, *De imperio Summarum potestatum circa sacra*.

Cap. 11. Sect.
5. &c.

Having thus laid down these necessary Precautions and Observations, I will now proceed and consider the mean Scope of Mr. B—'s Sermon; which is to prove that the Scripture Notion of Bishop and Presbyter is quite different from ours: That in the Scripture Sense they are one and the same, and their Power equal. Now therefore, in order to make what I have to say upon this Subject, clear and evident to the meanest Capacity; I will proceed according to these Steps or Positions.

I. I will shew that Christ has invested the Rulers of the Church with some Power.

II. That this Power was lodged by Christ in the Apostles, and their Successors for ever.

III. That this Power was not equally distributed to all, but that some were invested with the whole Power, and in the first Age of the Church were call'd Apostles or Angels, but afterwards Bishops; others were invested with part of this Power only, and were in the times of the Apostles sometimes called Bishops, sometimes Presbyters and Elders, but afterwards only Presbyters or Elders, to distinguish them from the other Order which was Superior to them.

IV. I will shew how inconclusive all Mr. B—'s Arguments or Objections are against this Doctrine.

I. Posit.

As for the first Position, *viz.* That Christ has invested the Rulers of the Church with some Power, I need say but little at present, because Mr. B— and all other Christians, except a few *Erastians*, *Hobbiets*, and *T—*, do acknowledge it; But however we may briefly consider, that

as Christ Jesus had Power given him to form and constitute a Church, so likewise did he make use of that Power, and founded a Society distinct from any Civil Society in the World : His Laws were independent on the Laws of *Cæsar*, for his Power was Spiritual, as he told *Pilate*, and that Society which he was going to erect (tho' it was distinct from, and should subsist for many Years, without the Favour and Protection, nay notwithstanding all the Malice and Fury of the Civil Power) yet it should do no Violence to the Government of Kings and Princes : And accordingly we read that the Christian Church subsisted by virtue of our Saviour's Institution, 300 Years before it had any countenance from Human Laws, and therefore subsisted by its own Power against all the Powers of the World.

So that it is plain that the Christian Society is in its own Nature distinct from all other Societies, since it is founded on a Charter, and incorporated by a Law that is utterly distinct from the Charters and Laws of all Civil Societies.

And so says our Learned *Jackson*, " To the Constitution of an intire visible Church, there is required (besides Unity of Profession, or the Unity of Faith profess'd, or of Moral Laws acknowledg'd) an Unity of Laws or Ordinances Judicial, or an Unity of Discipline, of Abstipulation or Obligation into a peculiar kind of Power, before *unusual* in other Societies or Corporations. In short, Christ has given his Church all that Power and Authority which is necessary for its Preservation. For, says he to the Governors of it, *As my Father sent me, so send I you* : Therefore whatever Power was necessary for the Rulers of his Church, that he gave them ; and of consequence those Rulers must have a Divine Right to it, which is enough at present to satisfy the first Step or Position.

Treat. of the
H.C. Church,
Chap. 8. in the
beginning.

John 20. 21.

As for the second, That this Power was lodged by Christ in the Apostles, and their Successors for ever, it is as undisputed as the other, and therefore I shall be as brief upon it ; and indeed it manifestly appears from the whole History of our Saviour : For he having laid the Foundation of his Church, and fulfilled his Ministry by laying down his Life for the Truth, he ordained others to continue the Government of the Church which he had so well begun, till his second coming. And that he did not bestow

II. Posit.

A Discourse occasioned by

bestow this Ecclesiastical Power to all his Followers in general is evident, because we plainly find, that he himself makes a Distinction, and gives a particular Commission to his Apostles to *Go and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* It was to them he directed his Discourse, when he *said, As my Father sent me, so send I you.* It was on them he *Breathed, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever Sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whose soever Sins ye retain they are retained.* It is therefore evident that all the Disciples were not made Rulers and Governours, for we are positively told, that *Christ called unto him his Disciples, and of them he chose Twelve, whom also he named Apostles.* And again it is said, that *He called unto him whom he would (i. e. of his Disciples) and ordained Twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to Preach, and to have Power to heal Sicknes, and to cast out Devils.* Thus again we are told, that *when he had called unto him his Twelve Disciples, he gave them Power against unclean Spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of Sicknes, and all manner of Disease; which makes it more than manifest, that all his Followers in general, were not vested with Ecclesiastical Power and Authority.*

And as he thus address'd himself to his Apostles in every Instance, and particularly speaks to them, *As my Father sent me, so send I you:* So this Commission must necessarily imply a Power of sending others into the Church, to exercise Rule and Authority, as he had sent them; and therefore he tells them he will be with them to the end of the World. This Commission therefore of sending others being originally granted to the Eleven Apostles (for there were no more immediately after Judas's Apostacy and Death) and to them only, as is evident from *his appearing to the Eleven as they sat at Meat, and renewing their Commission, to go into the World, and to Preach the Gospel.* And again, *Jesús (after his Resurrection) came unto the Eleven, and spake unto them, saying, All Power is given unto me in Heaven and Earth. Go ye therefore, &c.* This Commission being originally granted to them only, no others could have a Right to grant it to any, and of consequence this Power of the Church can be granted to none, but by the Apostles, and by such to whom the Apostles gave the same Commission, which

Mr. B---'s Ordination Sermon.

7

which is to none but those whom we call Ministers of the Gospel.

It can never be imagined that the Apostles gave this Power to the whole Body of the People ; because we always find it limited to select Persons, and that by Special Orders from the Apostles. For they *having Preached the Gospel at Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, confirming the Souls of the Disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the Faith, &c. They ordained them Elders in every Church, &c.* Acts 14. 22, 23. And to these, as the Stewards of God, they gave the Care and Charge of the Church, as appears when St. Paul called together the Elders of the Church at *Ephesus*, to whom he renews his Command, *that they take heed to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers.* Acts 20. 28. And he particularly charges the other Members of the Church to *Submit to, and Obey them.* Heb. 13. 17. From all which it is evident that the Power of the Church was lodged by Christ in the Apostles, and their Successors for ever. And therefore, since the Apostles bestow'd no Ecclesiastical Authority on their Successors, but what they first receiv'd from Christ : Whoever succeed them in this Authority are rightly said to hold it from Christ, and their Office to be *Jure Divino* : So that every part of that Authority which the Apostles and their Successors derive from Christ, must bear the same Image and Superscription ; not only the Preaching of the Gospel, and the Administration of the Sacraments, but the Power also of Ordaining, Governing, Censuring, &c. are all of the same Heavenly Extract : And of consequence, if it appears that the Apostles in constituting Ministers of the Gospel, gave not only the Power of Preaching and Administring the Sacraments, but the Power also of Ordination, and of the Keys, to some, such as we now call Bishops ; and part of this Power only to others, such as we call Presbyters ; it will be manifest, that these Bishops may be said as truly to derive their Power from Christ, as Presbyters, who receiv'd a part only of the Apostles Power ; nay, if there be any difference in the Origine of the Power, the Advantage must certainly be on their side who have received the whole Plenitude of the Churches Power.

This, I know, is the Point in Dispute between us and the Presbyterians, who say, that the whole Church-Power

III. Posit.

Power descended *equally* on all who were Ordain'd Ministers of the Gospel; and therefore to make this Matter as clear as possible, I will proceed to my third Position, which is to prove that this Ecclesiastical Power was not *equally* distributed to all, but that some were invested with the whole Power, and in the first Age of the Church were called Apostles or Angels, but afterwards Bishops: Others were invested with part of that Power only, and in the time of the Apostles were called sometimes Bishops, sometimes Presbyters, but afterwards only Presbyters, to distinguish them from the other Order which was Superior to them.

That there was a Superior governing Order among the Ministers of the Gospel, and that the Presbyters were but of the lower Rank, is so evident from the Practice of the Church for 1500 Years, that it is to be wonder'd how it should ever after be called in Question. But however, since this is the chief Controversie between us and our Dissenting Brethren, since this is what they sometimes call in our Church *Antichristian* and Abominable, and since this is made the Foundation of their Unchristian and groundless Division, I shall endeavour to make it appear that this was the very Government which our Saviour appointed in his Church, and which the Apostles and their Successors exactly observed and continued; and therefore to oppose such a Form of Government as this, must be Unscriptural.

Now then, to prove the Proposition, we must consider that there never was any Church of God's Appointment, but had Degrees of Governing Officers; and therefore we read in the Jewish Oeconomy three Orders of Consecrated Persons, who were to reside in and manage the Affairs of the Temple, *viz.* the High-Priest, the Priests, and the Levites: And as the Christian Church was to succeed the Jewish; nay, was really no more than the Jewish Church *Spiritualized*, and brought from under its *Types* and *Shadows*, it is but reasonable to think that our Saviour would keep as many of those Institutions as were consistent with his Design, and the Liberty of the Gospel: for should he have abolished every part of that Constitution, when some of it might, without any Inconvenience have been continued in the Christian Church, it would have been justly

justly looked upon by the Jews as an open Affront to that God who had appointed the Jewish Oeconomy, and would have been to the Jews a very great Prejudice against the Religion of the ever Blessed Jesus.

Our Saviour therefore who came not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law, came also to fulfil and perfect, but not to *destroy* the Jewish Church; and accordingly we find that the principal of the Jewish Usages were continued in the Christian Church after they had been purg'd and purified from the Jewish Superstitions. Thus their Baptism was continued, to signify our *Regeneration* by Christ: Thus are our *Excommunications* no more than *theirs* continued; and the Christian Ordination by Imposition of Hands, is plainly derived from *theirs*: And therefore, as they had an High-Priest, so likewise had the Christian Church in the Person of Christ; and as there were Priests and Levites under the High-Priest in the Jewish Oeconomy, so likewise did our High-Priest Christ Jesus constitute in his Church his Twelve Apostles and Seventy Disciples.

In our Saviour's Life-time therefore, we manifestly find three distinct Orders of *Consecrated* Persons; and Christ Jesus himself, who is called by St. Peter, *the Shepherd and Bishop of our Souls*, was the first Bishop of the Christian Church, his Twelve Apostles were Preachers and Rulers immediately under him; and his Seventy Disciples, an Order inferior to them; for though he ordained Twelve Apostles, and sent out Seventy Disciples, to whom he gave distinct Commissions, to Preach and Baptize, and work Miracles, yet he executed the whole *Legislative* Power and Episcopal *Authority* in his own Person, and gave no Power to any to *Ordain* or *Send*, or *Commission* others, till after his Resurrection.

Then indeed, a little before he ascended into Heaven, he enlarged the Commission of his Apostles, and gave them Authority to Rule and Govern his Church in his stead, and to Ordain and Send others into the Vineyard, as he had sent them, for a perpetual Succession to the World's End. 'Tis now he says unto them, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*; and promises to be with them to the End of the World. 'Tis now he breaths on them, saying, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*: And 'tis after their receiving of the

A Discourse occasioned by

Acts 6. 6.

Acts 15. 4.

the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost, that they first began to Settle and Form a Church, to Rule and Govern it. It was now, and not before, that they offered to Ordain others, according to their second Commission from their Master, and that with reference both to Presbyters and Deacons; as for Deacons, we are told, that *the Disciples having chosen Seven Eminent Persons, set them before the Apostles, to receive Imposition of their Hands.* And thus too, we are told, *They ordained them Elders in every City.* And we are sure that these Elders were distinguished, as well from the Apostles, as from Common Believers: For we are told that when St. Paul and Barnabas had been sent from *Antioch to Jerusalem* by the Eleven, *they were received of the Church (i. e. all the Believers there) and of the Apostles and Elders.*

Since therefore it is evident, that the Apostles did not begin to exercise any Jurisdiction over the Church till they had received a second Mission from their Master Christ Jesus: And since by their first Commission they were impowered to perform all the Offices of that Order of Men in the Church, who are now called Presbyters, *viz.* Preach and Baptize and remit Sins, &c. it is plain, even to a Demonstration, that they received some new Power by this second Mission which they had not before. 'Tis now their Commission was enlarged, and they were sent with all that Power which was necessary for the preservation of the Church: *For as my Father sent me, so send I you,* with the whole Ecclesiastical Power, whereas you had but part of it before. So that we find by what I have said on this Argument, in the first place, by Gods own express Appointment, three distinct Orders of Consecrated Persons in the Jewish Church. Secondly, We find that Christ fixed and settled the same Form of Government in his Church, though under different Names. Thirdly, We see that he gave his Apostles no other Commission than of doing as he had done in this particular; and of consequence he gave them a Command to settle for ever three distinct Orders of Church-Officers under the Gospel Oeconomy, as they saw he had done before them; and if they had not followed his Example, they would not have acted according to their Commission: Which is, I think, no weak Argument for the Divine Right of Episcopacy.

The

The reason why the Apostles after their second Mission, and their receiving the Holy Ghost did not call themselves High-Priests, was because there could be but one High-Priest who could make an expiation for our Sins : The Apostles could not become our Redeemers, nor offer themselves up for the Sins of the People as Christ did ; therefore they contented themselves with the Name which had been given them by Christ himself of Messengers, *ἀποστόλοι*, because they were immediately sent by him. — And those who succeeded them in their Authority, would not be called *ἀποστόλοι*, because they were not sent so immediately from Christ, nor had they all those miraculous Gifts, which the Apostles had : Out of *Modesty* therefore, they took on them the Name of *Bishops*, a Name which they had, before they receiv'd the Supreme Ecclesiastical Power in the Church of Christ, and which had been common to every *Presbyter*. This is the very Reason that *Ambrose* in his Commentaries on his Epistles to *Timothy*, (as he is quoted by *Sal-* De Primatu. *matius*) gives, why the Names *Bishop* and *Presbyter* that page 40. were promiscuously used in the time of the Apostles, were afterward distinguished. “ The Blessed Apostles, says he, de-
“ ceasing, those that were ordain'd to *Preside* over Church-
“ es after them, could not be equall'd to those first, nor
“ attain the like gift of Miracles, but appearing inferiour
“ to them in many other Things, thought it not *Decent* to
“ challenge to themselves the Name of Apostles ; and here-
“ upon they divided the Names, and left them, (i.e. the
“ *Inferiour Order of the Clergy*) the Name of *Presbyters*, and
“ the Others (i.e. those who *Presided*) were stiled *Bishops* :
“ And these were endued with the *Power of Ordaining*, that
“ they might know themselves to be set over the Church-
“ es in the fullest right. From that time *Presbyters* were
seldom or never call'd *Bishops* : So that if we run through
all the first Writers of the Church, after the Apostles, we
shall find that they take abundance of care to distinguish
between the Names of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, and never
give the Name of *Bishop* but to the highest Order of the
Church, nor that of *Presbyter*, but to the Second. This
is a Distinction I would desire the Reader carefully to ob-
serve, because upon the community of the Names, *Bishop*
and *Presbyter* in Scripture, depend most of the Arguments
of the *Presbyterians* : For we are willing to grant all this,

A Discourse occasioned by

because it is not the *distinction* of *Names*, but of the *Office* which we contend for, and if they will have those of a Superior Order from Presbyters, call'd Apostles or Angels, or any other Name whatsoever, and the Presbyters call'd Bishops, as they sometimes were in the Apostles Days, we shall be very well satisfied, provided they will acknowledge three different Orders, and continue their Unchristian Separation no longer, upon so slender and weak a Sophism.

This therefore being evident that there were three distinct Orders of Church Officers, when our Saviour was alive; and that he constituted the Apostles to officiate in His stead, after he had left the World: Let us next enquire how these Apostles left the Church; whether they also constituted Single Persons with the whole Ecclesiastical Power, and others with *Part* of it only, or whether, as the Presbyterians would perswade us, they bequeathed this Ecclesiastical Power *equally* to the whole Body of Presbyters, without any Distinction or Superiority of one above another.

Now the Answer to this Enquiry might be brought to a very short issue, if we said, that the Apostles could not by virtue of their Commission, let this Authority fall (like Gavel-kind Estates) equally among all Presbyters; because our Saviour, Himself, had not done it, but Instituted another Form of Government, and by His Example taught them to continue it for ever, when he was ascended into Heaven: This was certainly their Commission, and that they did not abuse it, but followed the Example, and answer'd the Design of our Blessed Saviour in this Particular; I will now endeavour to convince every impartial Enquirer.

In order therefore to make this evident, we must consider that when the Apostles had founded a Church in a City, and had constituted Elders there for the supply of the necessary and ordinary Offices of the Cure, they reserv'd the Rule and Government of them to themselves, as long as they saw it convenient. Thus we are told that some Years after Paul and Barnabas had preached the Gospel, and had ordained them Elders in every Church, Paul

, Acts 15. 36. *said unto Barnabas let us go again, and visit our Brethren in every City, where we have preached the Word of the Lord, and see how they do, (i. e.) how they have advanced in the knowledge*
of

of Christ. This was the Order which the Apostles constantly observed, and after they had made them several Visits, they then began to think of their own Mortality, and since the numbers of Believers increas'd in all places, lest they should suddenly be snatch'd away; and so the Church, for want of Persons who had power to Ordain, should be destitute of Clergy, they invested this Power in some single Persons of every Church, and appointed them to Rule and Govern with the same Authority as they had done, and to ordain others for the same purpose, to all succeeding Generations. But lest this should be thought only *gratis dictum*, and said without Proof, I will make it evident beyond all Contradiction, by several Instances: For besides, that it can never be imagined that the Apostles wou'd immediately abuse that Power which Christ had given them.

It is agreed on by all, that the Apostles were Superior both in Order and Power to the Elders, Bishops, or Presbyters, as they were taken for one another: And the Presbyterians confess that those which the Scripture calls Evangelists, were employ'd by the Apostles to do those things which common Presbyters could not: And particularly Mr. B— acknowledges in his Ordination Sermon, Serm. preach.
 " That the Scriptures, do indeed, suppose these Scriptu- on several
 " ral Bishops (*meaning Presbyters*) to have been under the Subjects, pag.
 " direction of the Apostles, and those Evangelists whom 418.
 " they employ'd in the Settlement of the Churches they
 " Planted. And again, 'tis granted that the Apostles did Pag. 427.
 " exercise a general Superintendency over all the Church-
 " es they Planted; and that the Evangelists were employ'd
 " by them, as their Assistants therein.

Now therefore, if the Apostles, according to their Commission, Ordain'd others with Power and Authority over the Presbyters, to reside in particular Churches, and whom they also called Apostles, it will then be evident according to the Presbyterians own Confession, that there were such Superintending Officers in every Church: The truth of this might be made out from *Erastus* and *Linus*, who were left by the Apostles, the one at Antioch, the other at Rome, with a peculiar Power over those Churches, to Ordain, to Rule, and to Censure them, according to the account of the first Fathers of the Church. I could also mention *Ephroditus*,

phreditus whom the same Fathers call the Bishop of Phillipi,
 Philip 2. 25. and expressly stiled by St. Paul, *their Apostle*. I supposed it necessary, says he, to send unto you Epaphroditus my Brother and companion in Labour, and fellow Soldier, but your Apostle, *ἀποστολὴν*. It is indeed render'd in our English Translation, Messenger, but without any good reason, for according to Theodoret's Comment on the Text, *ἐπισκοπικὴν διοίκησιν ἐπετίθεισόν ἐόν ἐκείνου πρεσβυτερίαν*, (i. e.) he was entrusted with Episcopal Government, being call'd Bishop. But because I design to confine myself intirely to the Holy Scriptures, and to that part of them which will admit of no Dispute; I will at this time wave these Instances.

And the first Instance I will insist on, shall be that of St. James, who was certainly the Apostle, or in our modern Dialect, the Bishop of Jerusalem: For if he was not one of the Twelve, as Dr. Scot, and a great many learn'd Men think, then it is plain, that he had a Superiority over the Elders of Jerusalem, and is therefore stiled by St. Paul an Apostle, and of consequence we have one of that Character planted in this City, to reside there, distinct from the Twelve Apostles: And because of his early Ordination to that See, St. Jerom calls him the Thirteenth Apostle.

But if he was one of the Twelve, as Hooker, Dr. Cave, and several others think, then it is evident, he was fix'd in that City by the other Apostles to Rule and Govern, and Ordain in Jerusalem. Thus says one of the Fathers, *Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, statim ab Apostolis Hierosolimorum Episcopus Ordinatus est*. And so says Eusebius to the same purpose. Upon which, the Judicious Hooker has this Observarion. "That the Consecration of James Bishop of Jerusalem to that Mother See of the World, "because it was not meet, that it should at any time be "left void of some Apostle, doth seem to be the very "cause of St. Paul's miraculous Vocation, to make up the "number of the Twelve again, for the gathering of Nations abroad, even as the Martyrdom of the other James, "the reason why Barnabas in his stead was called.

But however, whether he was one of the Twelve, or whether he was some other Consecrated upon this Occasion, this we are sure of, that he was a fix'd Apostle, and had the Preheminence in the Church of Jerusalem. This
 Mr.

Hier. de
 Scrip. Ecclef.
 Ecclef. Hist.
 lib. 2. c. 1.

Ecclef. poli.
 lib. 7. cir. init.

Mr. B— allows in the Appendix to his Sermon, but quarrels mightily with an unknown Author whom he attacks (and whose Book I confess I never saw, and therefore will not pretend to justify) because he degrades St. James from his Apostolical Dignity to make a Diocesan Bishop of him. Serm. pag. 417.

“ Which, as he says in his Sermon, is to consult the extent
“ of the Apostolical Office and Dignity, as in our modern
“ Language he would consult the Dignity of a Diocesan
“ Prelate, that should entitle him the Curate of a Country
“ Village.

Now, in Answer to this Objection, We say that whoever had the Power of Ordination, Confirmation, and Supreme Jurisdiction, were in those Days call'd Apostles, whether they were fix'd or limited to any particular Diocess or not; for that does no way alter the Spiritual Power and Jurisdiction, which is the same in all places: As for Example, A Bishop is a Bishop of the whole Church of Christ, and the limitation of his Power to a particular District, is wholly owing to Compact and Agreement, for the avoiding of the Disorder which might otherwise happen: This was the Reason why St. Paul confined himself to the Gentiles, and St. Peter to the Jews, without any diminution or lessening of their Power: And if St. Paul, after all his tedious and hazardous Journies in planting of Churches and propogating the Gospel among the Gentiles, had sat down and resided at any of them, it would have been very far, either from a degradation of Him, or a disparagement to his Order and Dignity, for he would still have had the same Power and Authority as before: In short, it seems pretty plain to me, that the Apostolical Office was, what we now call Episcopal, and the Episcopal, Apostolical, both of them consisting in the Supreme, Spiritual Government of the Church: For as Theodoret, speaking of the first times, expresses it, *Those which we after call'd Bishops, were then called Apostles*: So that really an Apostle was a moving Bishop to Found Churches, and a Bishop, a settled Apostle to Govern them.

Theod. on the
Epist. to the
Philip.

A second Instance shall be that of Timothy, who was certainly left by St. Paul at Ephesus, (in his last Journey he made to visit the Churches) as their fix'd and settled Bishop, with a Preheminence, and Episcopal or Apostolical Authority over the Elders and Church of Ephesus, which was
not

not common to the Body of the Presbytery : For we are sure, that *Timothy* had a peculiar Charge given by *St. Paul*,
 1 Tim. 4. 11. not only over the Laity to *command, and teach them*, but also
 1 Tim. 5. 17, over the Elders and Presbyters, as appears, when he is
 18, 19, 20; 21. commanded to exercise Jurisdiction over them, to *receive Accusations against them*, and if he found them Guilty to *put them to an open shame*; and all this, with that impartiality as becomes a Christian Judge, *without preferring one before another*. And as for his Ordination of others he is charged particularly, *to lay Hands suddenly on no Man*: And what makes this Power the more remarkable, is, that it was given him after many Elders had been constituted in the Church of *Ephesus*. Now therefore, it is evident, that *Timothy* had a Power Superior to the rest of the Elders of that City. For if the whole Power of the Church had been lodged in the Body of Presbyters, to what purpose shou'd he only be exhorted not to receive an Accusation against an Elder, unless attested by two or three Witnesses, if he himself was but one of the whole Body? Or to what purpose should *St. Paul* beseech him so earnestly to abide there, and give only to *him*, such particular Directions about Ordinations, if he cou'd do no more in it than any one of the Body of the Presbytery? And if *they* could have Ordain'd without him, if *they* had been in possession of the whole Ecclesiastical Power, it would have been an Affront and an Encroachment on their Jurisdiction and Power, to have set any one over them, *as their fix'd and constant Governour*, to do that which they themselves had Power to do: So that let *Timothy* be an Evangelist, or an extraordinary Officer, when he was *St. Paul's* Companion and Assistant, or what ever else *Mr. B—* and the Presbyterians will please to have him, this we are sure of, that the Elders or Presbyters of *Ephesus*, cou'd not Ordain Elders, nor exercise this Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdiction of themselves; and therefore was *Timothy* left among them, as their fix'd and settled Bishop and Governour for the time to come, which is sufficient for our purpose, to shew that mere Presbyters were not indued with the whole Plenitude of Ecclesiastical Power.

The last Instance I shall mention is, the Superiority of *Titus* over the Elders of the Church of *Crete*, for he was left there by *St. Paul* as their fix'd and ordinary Bishop and Ruler,

Mr. B—'s Ordination Sermon.

17

Ruler, to set in order the things that were wanting, and to Or- Tit. 1. 5.
dain Elders in every City. By which it appears he had some
Power confer'd on him, and particularly that of ordain-
ing Elders, punishing obstinate Offenders with the Cen-
sures of the Church, &c. which the Presbyters that were
there before, had not. From whence it is evident that St.
Paul made *Timothy* and *Titus* settled Governours of the Tim. 2. 15.
Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, and placed them over the
Presbyters of those Churches; with such Power and Au-
thority as Bishops now Claim, by that Commission which
they derive from Christ: As for the Temporal Power and
Jurisdiction which they derive from the Crown, it is no-
thing to Mr. B—'s purpose; for the Authority they claim
from Christ, is Spiritual, the same which *Timothy* and *Ti-*
tus had over the Clergy and People of *Crete* and *Ephesus*, af-
ter they were fix'd and settled in those Places, as their Bi-
shops and Governours.

The force and light of this Truth is so strong and bright, First Paper
that the Presbyterians themselves cannot but acknowledge sent to the
a singular Authority, as to some things, namely as to Or- King in the
daining of Presbyters and Deacons, and exercising Cen- Isle of Wight,
sures over Presbyters and others, to have been given to Otho. 3d. p. 3. 7.
Timothy and *Titus*, which was not given to all other Pres- Second Pap.
byters of the Ephesian and Cretan Churches, which is all Jus. Div. Mi-
that we desire or contend for. For if the Presbyters had nis. Ang. p.
not the Power of Ordaining Others when *Timothy* and *Ti-* 71. 72.
tus were left among them, we desire to know what Time
after, they received their Commission: For if they had no
such Power given them at their First Ordination, they will
hardly ever be able to prove, that the whole Body of Pres-
byters had a Second Ordination, whereby they were invest-
ed with this Episcopal Authority; and whatever they say
to evade this Argument drawn from *Timothy* and *Titus*, is
nothing but begging of the Question, and after all they
can say, it is sufficient for our purpose, that the Presbyters
of those Places cou'd not Ordain without them.

All therefore I shall add more on this Particular, shall
be from St. *John*, who when he was in the Isle of *Patmos* a-
bout the Year of our Lord 95 or 96, had a particular Revel-
lation to write to the Seven Angels of the Seven Churches
of *Asia*. Now it will be very evident to any impartial En-
quirer, that those Seven Angels, were so many Single Per-

Rev. 2. and
Chap. 3.

Act. 20. 17.

Rev. 1. 20.

Rev. 2. 2.

sons indued with that Power and Authority over these Churches, which we call *Episcopal*: For I think it is clear beyond all Contradiction, that they were *Single Persons*, because the Holy Ghost constantly represents them as such: Thus he speaks to the *Angel* of the Church of *Ephesus*, thus also to the *Angel* of the Church in *Smyrna*, thus also to the *Angel* of the Church of *Thyatira*, and thus also to the rest. Now it is undoubted there were many more Presbyters than *One* in each of these *Single Churches*: and the Scriptures assure us, nay the *Presbyterians* acknowledge, that there were *divers* Presbyters in the Church of *Ephesus*, when St. Paul sent for them to come to *Miletus* to him; therefore the *Angel* of that Church cannot be said to be the Presbyter of that Church, because there were *many* Presbyters there, and but *one* Angel: And we never any where read the name of Angel given to the College of Presbyters.

And it is no less evident that these seven single Persons whom the Apostle calls Angels, and likeneth to *Seven Stars*, were invested with that Power and Authority over these Churches, which we now call *Episcopal*: For they are particularly call'd to an account for not exercising their Authority and Apostolical Jurisdiction not only over the Laity, but the Clergy also. Thus is the Angel of the Church of *Pergamus* censured for suffering the Doctrine of *Balaam*, and the *Nicolaitans* to be held there: But now if every Presbyter had an *Independent* Authority, how cou'd the *Angel* of this Church be blam'd *in particular*, for not censuring and punishing those over whom he had no Power, or for not preventing the Heretical Opinion of those, of whom he had no Cognisance? And as for the Angel of *Ephesus*, he is particularly commended for searching and examining those who *pretended* to be Apostles, and to have Power and Authority, to Preach without a *Commission*: Which commendation plainly denotes a Supreme Power of Tryal and Conviction.

And that this Power was *Episcopal*, according to our Notion of it, is farther evident from all the Writers of the first Times, who give us a particular account of those Single Persons, who presided over and governed those Churches, as might be made as clear as the Sun, if we would examine the first Records of the Church: But because I design to follow Mr. B—'s Example, and confine my self to the Ho-
ly

ly Scriptures, I shall defer such Proofs from Antiquity 'till *J. B.* denies, or is pleas'd to call for them. And I think, what I have offer'd from the Sacred Oracles of GOD may be sufficient to convince any impartial, unbiass'd Reader, of the Divine Right of that Form of Church Government which we call Episcopal. I pass on therefore to my fourth IV. Posit. and last Step or Position, which is to shew how inconclusive all Mr. B--'s Arguments or Objections are against this Doctrine: And my task, will I hope, be so much easier for having shewn upon how solid a Foundation Episcopacy stands:

There are two sorts of Arguments by which Mr. B-- attempts to establish Presbytery, and destroy the Hierarchy of the Church; the first taken from the community of the Name Bishop and Presbyter in Scripture, the second taken from the Power of Ordination, which, he says, was in the hands of the Presbytery.

The first sort of Arguments which *J. B.* brings to establish Presbytery, and destroy Episcopacy, is taken from the promiscuous use of the word Bishop and Presbyter in Holy Writ, and from thence, without any reason, he concludes that not only their Names, but their Offices also were always the same, and that there was no Superiour Order over the Presbyters in the times of the Apostles: And this he thinks he Proves by several Instances from Scripture.

Mr. B--'s Sermons on var. Subj. page 408. 409, &c.

Now, tho', I think, I have already Proved that there was a Superiour Order to Presbyters in the Apostles times; and could immediately put an end to all *J. B.* has said on this Argument, by granting that the Names Presbyter and Bishop were used promiscuously to denote the second Order of the Clergy in the Apostles Days; and that the Superiour Order which we now call Bishops, were then called Apostles or Angels, and that I do not contend for the Name, but the Thing; yet I will defer it a little longer [because I should otherwise cut off two Thirds at least of what Mr. B-- has to say on this Subject,] and apply it as I think most proper to his particular Instances.

The first Instance therefore which he produces, is that Sermon page noted Passage, as he calls it, of the Acts of the Apostles: 408.

where we read, "That the Apostle Paul hastening to *Je-* Acts 20. 16.

rusalem, where he design'd, if possible, to be at the Day of 17. 28.

"Pentecost, sent from Miletus to Ephesus, and call'd the Elders

A Discourse occasioned by

“ of the Church. And these Elders he exhorts at Verse 28.
 “ to take heed to themselves and to all the flock, over which the
 “ Holy Ghost had made them Bishops, to feed the Church of GOD
 “ which he had purchased with his own Blood.

Ser. p. 409.

Well now, what is it that *J. B.* wou'd Prove from this? Why, “ That the same Persons were in Scripture called
 “ indifferently Elders and Bishops: Bishops from their
 “ Office of inspecting and feeding; the Flock, and El-
 “ ders from their Age and Authority.

Lib. 3. cap. 14.

Tert. adv. va-
lent. cap. 5. p.
252.

In catalo.

But suppose we should desire *J. B.* to prove that none of the Bishops of *Asia* were called to *Miletus*, that none but barely the Presbyters of *Ephesus* were there, he can have nothing but very uncertain Conjectures for his Assertion, and those too, against the exprefs Testimony of the Primitive Fathers: And I leave the Christian Reader to judge which is rather to be depended on for the proof of such a Matter of Fact, Mr. *B.*— or those who lived so near the Apostles. Thus St. *Ireneus*, (who was made Bishop of *Lyons*, about the Year of Christ 189, and who was deservedly stil'd by *Tertullian*, *Omnium Doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator*, The most curious Searcher into all kinds of Doctrines) positively affirms that St. *Paul* called both Bishops and Presbyters from *Ephesus*. And St. *Jerom* himself testifies, that there were several Bishops in *Asia*, in the Apostles times.

Acts 20. 18.

ver. 25.

But does not the Text say, He sent to *Ephesus*, and call'd the Elders of the Church? It does. But does it from thence follow that he call'd the Elders of no other Church in *Asia*? By no means, For his Address to them, does plainly intimate the contrary, when he appeals to them all among whom he had been for three Years, concerning the innocence of his Life and Conversation. When they were come to him, he said unto them, ye know from the first Day that I came into *Asia*, after what manner I have been with you at all Seasons. And again, Now behold, I know that ye all among whom I have been preaching the Kingdom of GOD, shall see my Face no more. From whence it seems very clear that this Speech was address'd to all those of *Asia* among whom he had preach'd the Kingdom of GOD. And I hope *J. B.* will own that it was to more than to the Church of *Ephesus*. But in answer to this, he tells us, “ That his haste in going to *Jerusalem* would not
 “ permit the sending to all the Parts of *Asia*, to gather to-
 “ gether so many Bishops in the modern Sense, to meet
 “ him

Serm. pag.
e 409, 410.

Mr. B——'s Ordination Sermon.

21

“ him at *Miletus*, unless we suppose the greatest part of
 “ them to have been *Scandalous Non-residents*, and to have
 “ learn'd the *Modern Practice*, &c.

But now (to pass by his unhandsome Reflections in relation to Non-residence) how does Mr. B—— know what he affirms? How does he know but that the other Bishops of *Asia* had notice of St. Paul's coming to *Ephesus*, as he design'd, and that they met there to receive some necessary Directions for the management of the Affairs of the Church, and to take their last farewell of him? This I think is no improbable Supposition, and then I hope, the Scandale of Non-residence, as he calls it, will be taken off: For Mr. B—— would think it very hard Measure to be tax'd with the same Scandal, if he were sent for to Britain about some necessary Affairs of the Church; and I am sure the same Insinuation looks very ill, to say no worse of it, with relation to our modern Bishops; for when any necessary Business either of the Church or State, or of their Own, calls them, they may lawfully be absent from their Charge, without so uncharitable, and unchristian an Insinuation.

But J. B. tells us again, “ That it could not be the Elders of the several Churches, because it is only said he called for the Elders of the Church in the singular Number, not of the Churches in the Plural. Serm. p. 410.

And pray what then? Is it any impropriety to say, he sent for the Elders of the Church, in general Terms, tho' there were many Bishops of particular Churches at that time assembled in *Ephesus*, for the Reasons I just now mentioned? The Text does not “ expressly say that the Apostle sent for the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*, as Mr. B—— very wrongfully Quotes it; but that he sent to *Ephesus*, Serm. p. 409.
 “ to call the Elders of the Church, i. e. of the *Asian* Church in general, which were met at *Ephesus* upon this Occasion: And if the Clergy not only of *Asia*, but of *Europe* also, had met there, the Apostle might have used the same Expression, with the greatest propriety. Acts 20. 17.

And now I have said all this in Answer to his first Instance, only to let Mr. B—— and the rest of the Presbyterians see, what weak Conjectures they are forced to take hold of, to support their Cause: For after all, granting all they would have, that only the Presbyters of *Ephesus* were

A Discourse occasioned by

were called to *Miletus*, I would fain know what material Point they would gain by the Concession. Oh, a very material one, that there were a good number of Presbyters at *Ephesus*, and that they were sometimes called Bishops; and what then? Will they prove from hence that the Apostle *St. Paul* was not Superiour to them, and had no Power which they had not? Can they from hence prove that the Presbyters were equal to *Timothy* whom *St. Paul* left to preside over them? By no means. What then? Nothing that I can see, but that Bishop and Presbyter at that time signified the same thing, which I may very readily grant, without doing the least prejudice to my Cause: For if at that time, they had no such Person over them as we now call Bishop, as doubtless they had not, (for *Timothy* was left there several Years after, as Bishop *Pearson* has demonstrated) then the Apostle himself was their Bishop, and he now call's them together to give them, as it were, a Visitation Sermon, and Directions how to discharge themselves faithfully, as Ministers of GOD.

Bp. Pearson.
De Serie, &
successione
primorum
Romæ, Epif-
coporum.
pag. 75. 76.

Serm. p. 410.

Phil. i. i.

But since he has been thus unsuccessful in his first Instance, which was his chief Bulwark, let us see what fortune he will have in the next, "Which is the Inscription of *St. Paul's* Epistle to the Saints at *Philippi*, *Paul* and *Timotheus*, the Servants of Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus which are at *Philippi*, with the Bishops and Deacons: From whence he concludes, that there were but two Orders in the Church of Christ, Bishops, or Presbyters, and Deacons, therefore Bishop and Presbyter is the same in Scripture. As for what he says against *Dr. Hammond's* Exposition of that place, (supposing it all true) it is nothing to his purpose. And tho' a great deal may be said for the Doctor's Opinion, yet I will not insist on it, because I do not care for mixing any uncertainty in a matter which may admit of a clearer light: Tho' I confess that the Doctor has brought such Arguments to prove that *Philippi* was a Metropolis, as will sway more with any Man, than *Mr. B—'s* bare Assertion that it was not. And as for the Fathers whose concurrent Judgment he boasts, is for him, will be found against him, if he will give himself the trouble to look over them: For if he will read *Eusebius*, and other Ecclesiastical Historians, he will find that there were Metropolitans Superiour to other Bishops,

Dr. Hammond
on the place.

Serm. p. 411.

shops, if not in the Apostles Days, at least soon after them; as plainly also appears from the Apostolical Canons, ^{Apost. Canon 34} which suppose these Primates or Metropolitans to be known and settled; for thus one of those Canons decrees, That Bishops shall do nothing of Moment without the *Primate*, except in their own Diocess; nor yet the *Primate* without the Bishops.

But however, we need none of these things to support our Cause, because granting (as I have all along done) that in the Times of the Apostles, the Names Presbyter and Bishop were Titles belonging to the same Order of the Church; what would Mr. B— infer from this Inscription of St. Paul in his Epistle to the *Philippians*? What one Point will he gain for the Advancement of Presbytery? For, supposing they were the same, I hope, in Requital for my Concession, he will grant that those Bishops, Overseers or Presbyters, were Inferior to, and Subject to the Apostles, which is all that I contend for at this time.

“ But it may be said, if there was any Superiour Order of the Clergy among them, they would certainly have been named: And therefore, since none but Bishops or Presbyters and Deacons, are mentioned; it is evident that these Presbyters were the Supreme Order of Ecclesiastical Officers at *Philippi*. In answer to which, I would desire those who make this Objection, only to consider, that as St. Paul was the Founder of this Church; so, for some time, he kept it under his own peculiar Jurisdiction (as he did all others of his own Planting;) and therefore he was the Supreme Governor of it himself: And accordingly *Tertullian* reckons it among the Apostolical Churches, i. e. as he himself explains them, *Apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis Præsident*: Those Churches over which some Apostle was known to have presided. So that here we find evidently, Presbyters and Deacons, and St. Paul their Apostle; or, in our Sense, their Bishop, presiding over them. Acts 16.

The next Instance which Mr. B— brings to prove Bishops and Presbyters the same, is the Text on which he preach'd his Sermon, “ If a Man desires the Office of a Bishop, he desires a good Work. But how he can possibly prove his Assertion from it, I confess I do not understand, (though if he could prove the Names to have been used

promiscuously, it would do no prejudice at all to the Cause of Episcopacy, as I have more than once observed already) for how does he prove that the Office of a Bishop in this place, must necessarily signify the Office of a Presbyter? He does not give the least colour of Proof for it; and therefore I conclude he could not, and so I shall take no further Notice of it.

Tit. 1. 7.
Serm. pag.
412.

Another Instance of Mr. B—, is from *Tit. 1. 7.* where he tells us, “the Bishop there mentioned, is represented “as one of those Elders which *Titus* was to Ordain in every City (or Town) of *Crete*, to take care of the particular Churches that were planted in them.

But now, suppose I should say, with some Commentators, that the Bishop mentioned in the 7th Verse, was really one invested with such Authority as we now call Bishops; because *Titus*, as a Metropolitan, was to Ordain others to the same Supreme Dignity: Suppose, I say, I should make this Plea, Mr. B— would find it no easy matter to prove any thing to the contrary. But however, supposing they do signify the same Persons and Office, yet they are Subject to *Titus*, who Ordained them; and therefore this Text can do the Presbyterian Cause no Service in the World: It may amuse the People, but can never prove that Presbyters were the Supreme Order of Church-Officers, when it is every where evident, that there were others who presided over them: Nay, the very design of this Epistle of St. Paul to *Titus*, and of those to *Timothy*, is to give them Directions how to Rule and Govern the Church, especially the Clergy over whom they presided. And really, if we could but suppose that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not of an Order Superiour both to Presbyters and Deacons, Mr. B—, or any Man else, would find it a very difficult Task to make Sense of those Epistles.

1 Pet. 5. 3.
Serm. pag.
413, 414.

The next Instance Mr. B— mentions, is out of the Epistle General of St. Peter, “where when the Apostle addresses himself “to the Elders of several Churches scattered through Pontus, Galatia, &c. he charges them to feed the Flock of God, taking the Oversight thereof [*ἐπισκοπῆς*] or acting the part of a Bishop towards “it. from whence he concludes, that these Elders must have been Bishops, and Residents; “for the object of their “Care was the Flock of God among them (*i. e.* with whom “they did daily reside and converse, to whom they were “capable

“capable of being Examples) whereas they could not
“feed those Flocks, with whom they seldom or never
“once *converted*, &c.

Now, suppose for once, I grant Mr. B—, that St. *Peter* speaks in this place to all Degrees and Ranks of Church-Officers whatever, and gives them this General Direction of *Feeding the Flock of God among them*, (which is a Concession large enough, I am sure of) does it therefore follow that Presbyters were the Supreme Order, when it is every where manifest that they were not? Every Bishop, in our Sense of the Word, is certainly a Presbyter, but it does not follow by any Logick, that therefore every Presbyter is a Bishop: They have both the same Power and Employment in several Instances, but yet there is no necessity they should have the same in every particular; as for Example: It is certain that some who are Presbyters (though not mere Presbyters) have the power of Ordaining others; but then it does not follow that therefore all may, any more than it would follow, that because one Alderman, after he is duly Elected and Sworn, may perform the Office of a Lord Mayor: therefore every one may, *before* he is Elected and Sworn. And I dare challenge *J. B.* or any one else, either out of this or any other place of Scripture; or indeed, for several hundred Years after Christ, to produce any one Instance wherein Ordination by mere Presbyters was accounted valid: And then I desire our Dissenting Brethren to consider, how they can answer it to their Consciences, to break the Peace of the Church, and make that the Ground of a Separation, for which their Teachers cannot produce one Instance, for some hundreds of Years after our Blessed Saviour.

There are two more Instances which Mr. B— begs leave to make use of, before he dismisses this Set of Arguments against Episcopacy: The first of which is taken out of the first Epistle of St. *Paul* to the *Thessalonians*, where he

Serm. pag.

414, 415.

1 Thes. 5. 12,

13.

“*beseeches them to know those that laboured among them, and were*
“*over them in the Lord, and admonished them; and to esteem them*
“*very highly in Love for their Works sake.* From which place he would conclude that the Presbyters only are to be taken notice of, because the Bishops of the Establish'd Church cannot be esteem'd highly for their Works “Sake,
“by those who never heard them preach, nor enjoy'd

A Discourse occasioned by

“any of their Labours. This is, I think, the full Design, and whole Substance of *J. B.*’s Argument from this Portion of Scripture.

But how inconclusive it is, any one may see who does but just look upon the Text ; and the whole Argument runs upon this one grand Mistake, which is common to all that Party, that there was but one Congregation in *Thessalonica*, as well as in other Cities, though never so large ; and has been confuted over and over, even to a Demonstration, by *Dr. Maurice*, in his *Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy*, and by several others. But besides, I will put the Case to *Mr. B.*—, and suppose, that there was an Epistle wrote, and directed to the Presbyterian Church in *Dublin*, wherein these very Words of the Apostle were made use of, wou’d not he, and all the World, imagine, that it was a Command to the people of *Dublin*, to honour and respect their Spiritual Pastors in general, whether they had ever heard this or that particular Pastor preach or not ? Could any one therefore think there was but one single Congregation of Presbyterians in this City ? And would not *Mr. B.*— look upon it as a very unnatural and perverse wresting of the Text for any one to say, How should those esteem you, *J. B.* for your Works sake, who never heard you preach, nor enjoyed any of your Labours ? This is *Mr. B.*—’s own Argument ; and I dare leave it to himself, either to approve or condemn it.

But again, does *Mr. J. B.* imagine that there is no Work for which a Minister of the Gospel ought to be esteemed, but Preaching ? Does he imagine that the sending of *fit Persons* into God’s Vineyard, and keeping them to their Duty, is not of as great Consequence, and ought to be as highly esteemed and respected ? But this way of Arguing is so very weak, that I am quite tir’d of it : I will therefore dismiss this Text, and go to the next.

Heb. 13. 14.
Serm. pag.
415. 416.

And this he tells us is in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, where the Apostle “*exhorts them to obey those that Rule over them, or their Guides.* [*ἡγουμένους*] For, says he, they watch for “*your Souls, as those that must give an Account.* From whence he concludes, That those who watch over, and must give an Account of Mens Souls, must be Presbyters, and not Bishops, according to our Modern Notion of the Word ; and yet they are called *ἡγούμενοι*, Leaders, or Rulers and Governors.

Now

Now in answer to this, we own that the Presbyters did share in the Government of the Church under the Bishops, and therefore in some Sense may be called *ῥητορες*, Rulers; and if from this Community of Names, they will infer right or wrong, an Equality of Power, we cannot help it: But then they must be obliged too, to conclude that there was then no difference between an Apostle and an ordinary Pastor or Elder, because the very same Name was common to both: For St. Peter speaking to the Elders, calls himself by the same Name: *The Elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder.* So that from this Text we cannot tell who is intended; for they may be either Bishops or Presbyters, or both, for any thing we can gather from it. Ay, but they must be Presbyters, because they watch for our Souls. But I would fain desire to know of J. B. whether the Souls of Men are not likely to be better watch'd over when there are not only Presbyters appointed for that Work, but others also to preside over them, to see they do their Duty conscientiously, than when the Souls of Men are committed to some one Man's Care, who has no Superiour in this World, to call him to an account for his Neglect of it? Let him but seriously consider this, and give a satisfactory Answer to it, and then I will examine it more particularly; but till then I shall dismiss it, because it is nothing to his purpose; and yet it is upon such slight Presumptions that the Presbyterian Cause subsists: And I can't but admire that any Men of Sense should be drawn into such a pernicious Unchristian Division, upon such weak Suggestions: But I find any thing will serve the turn to abuse Men, who are resolved to abuse themselves.

As for what J. B. says concerning the Postscripts to the Sermon. pag. second Epistle to *Timothy*, and that to *Titus*; we confess 416. that they are not of undoubted Authority, and therefore we never make use of them upon this Occasion; and indeed, we stand in no need of them, as I have abundantly proved: So that though I should grant that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists and extraordinary Officers, yet it would be proved, even to a Demonstration, that the Presbyters could not do what they did, for then the sending of them would have been to no purpose, as I have observed already: But that they were not

always such extraordinary Officers, I will prove hereafter.

Serm. p. 417.
418.

Upon the whole *J. B.* concludes, "That we never once read in Scripture of those call'd Elders or Ministers of the Gospel, as any part of the Scriptural Bishops charge, they are no where mentioned as subjected to their Authority, &c. And pray what then? Do we insist upon it? No, for as long as he acknowledges that his Scriptural Bishops or Elders were under the direction and government of the Apostles, and those Persons whom *he calls Evangelists*, it is as much as we desire or contend for at present: For certainly if we supposed, as he does, that Bishops and Presbyters were Names common to the same Persons, now, as they were in the Apostles Days, we could never say that Presbyters were under Bishops, for that would be Nonsense, and would make Presbyters both above and under themselves, which is too gross a Conclusion for Men of any Sense to make.

Serm. p. 419.

J. B. tells us that he could do Wonders had he not confined himself to Scripture, "and could shew that even when the Name of Bishop and Elder came to be distinguished, the Bishop was no more for some considerable time, than the Senior Pastor of a particular Flock, which he governed in conjunction with the rest of the Elders, without any distinction of Office. — But I am sure that all Antiquity, as well as Scripture, contradicts this Assertion, and whenever he pleases to produce his Evidence, it shall not fail of being consider'd. He says, indeed, that the Bishop of *Ignatius* appears to be no more than this Senior Presbyter, but how he makes it out, I cannot understand; for I can scarce think, that he intends those Quotations which he brings out of *Ignatius*, for any proof of his Assertion: Thus, according to *Ignatius*, as *Mr. B—* tells us, a Church was [*Plebs Episcopo coadunata*] a Christian Flock united to their Bishop. Therefore, (his Conclusion, if any, must be) a Bishop was no more than the Senior Pastor of a particular Flock or Congregation: But by what Logic he can infer this Consequence, I own my self a Stranger, and I believe, that every one else that reads it, will do so too.

Ordin. Serm.
pag. 419.

Ibidem.

Again, "There is (saith *Ignatius*) to every Church one Altar and one Bishop, together with the Elders and Deacons.

“ Deacons. And here again, I confess I am at a loss how he can, from this Proposition of *Ignatius*, deduce his Consequence, that the Bishop was no more than the Senior Presbyter without any distinction of Office : From hence indeed he might justly conclude, that in the Days of *Ignatius*, there were three distinct Orders of Consecrated Persons, viz. Bishops, Elders or Presbyters and Deacons ; but that this Bishop was no more than the Senior Presbyter, I cannot conceive, neither does Mr. B— attempt to prove. And indeed all that *Father's* Epistles, run on a quite contrary Supposition ; for (to give one Instance for all) St. *Ignatius*, writing to the *Magnesian*s, and having just before spoken of *Damas* their Bishop, from thence he takes occasion to exhort them not to contemn their Bishops Age ; but, says he, “ Pay him all Reverence, according to the Will of GOD the Father, as I know the holy Presbyters do, not looking upon the Youth that appears in him, but the Prudence which he receives from GOD. From which Passage it is evident, that the Bishop in St. *Ignatius's* Days was more than the Senior Presbyter : And *Ignatius* himself, if we will believe the most Antient Writers of the Church, succeeded St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul* in the Bishoprick of *Antioch* ; and I hope Mr. B— will own that those Apostles were something more than the Senior Pastors of that place. Epist. ad Magnesianos.

But Mr. B— tells us again, “ That every Bishop had one Altar or Communion-Table for that one Flock. And here I am once more at a loss for his Conclusion ; for how this proves the Bishop to be no more than the Senior Pastor, I cannot comprehend : But I believe Mr. B— has dropt that Consequence ; and would only (with Mr. *Baxter* and Others) conclude from these places of *Ignatius*, that there was but one Congregation for every Bishop to look after, and of consequence the Bishop could be no more than a common Presbyter. Pag. 419.

But this has been so often Answer'd by Dr. *Maurice*, Mr. *Dodwel*, and several Others who have enter'd the List with Mr. *Baxter*, that it is in vain to add any thing to what they have said upon it : For the Matter in short was thus, (as Dr. *Maurice* in the place before Quoted observes) “ The Principal Church, or Meeting-place, in every City, belong'd to the Bishop, where his Chair was set up, with Dr. Maur. vin. of the Prim. Chu. pag. 34. 35, &c. Dedw. Disco. of one Altar and one Priesthood.

One Alt. and
one Priest.
pag. 290.

“ a Bench of Presbyters on every Side, circling the Communion-Table ; and was call’d *Altare*, or *Sacrarium*, and within the Jurisdiction of a single Bishop ; it is probable there was no more than one ; the Bishop with his Presbyters and Deacons, represented the unity of the Church, *although it might be divided into several Congregations*, and every Congregation might have a *Communion-Table* : So that to set up an Altar, is not to have two Communion-Tables in a City, but to have distinct Governments, and opposite Bishops and Presbyters. “ Thus according to the Notions receiv’d in those times (says Mr. Dodwel) the *Bishops* answer’d the *High-Priests* in this very particular, that all within his *Jurisdiction*, i. e. all who, upon other Occasions, did ordinarily meet in *general Assemblies*, were thought obliged to a dependance on those Assemblies, in which the Bishop did preside ; as the whole Nation of the Jews, wherever dispersed, were to those of *Jerusalem*, as the fix’d residence of the *High-Priest*.

In short the principal Church in which the Bishop resided, was, what we now call the *Cathedral*, and the *Communion-Table* in this Cathedral, was called the *Altar* : So that one *Altar*, is as consistent with many *Communion-Tables*, as one Cathedral is with many Churches. And those very Fathers who mention one Altar, do at the same time mention several Communion-Tables, which utterly overthrows Mr. B—’s and Mr. Baxter’s Inference, that they must therefore have consisted of single Assemblies : This is but a bad Sample of what Mr. B— could do from the Fathers ; but however, with this sad threatening of what he could do, he dismisses his first sort of Arguments where-with he pretended to establish the Presbyterian Parity, and produces another sort, much more formidable, whereby he pretends to prove that the Power of Ordination, was given to every Presbyter, and that they actually Ordain’d others for the Work of the Ministry. — If he proves this, he does indeed make a great Breach in the Hierarchy of the Church ; and here I dare make him this Promise, that if he can produce any one Instance of a Presbyter Ordain’d by Presbyters only, and allowed by the Church, for several Hundred Years after Christ, I will acknowledge him an Invincible Champion for the Presbyterian Cause.

He

He tells us indeed, that not only the Epistles and Evangelists, or these "Extraordinary Officers, but that Serm. pag. 423. 424.
 "the Ordinary Officers of the Church (meaning bare
 "Presbyters) did exercise the power of Ordination :
 "And the main Proof that J. B. or any of the Presby-
 "terians, bring for their Assertion, is that *known* Place,
 "as Mr. B— calls it, of St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy, 1 Tim. 4. 14.
 "where St. Paul exhorts Timothy not to neglect the Gift that is
 "in him, which was given him by Prophecy, with laying on of
 "the Hands of the Presbytery.

Now in Answer to this, we may observe, first, That it is no easy matter to know what the Apostle means in this place, by the Hands of the Presbytery ; and yet whatever is meant by it, it will do J. B. no Service in the World.

A great many Commentators of the best Note do say, St. Chrisost.
 that the Word *πρεσβυτεριον*, if it be taken for the Ordain- Theodoret.
 ers, must be understood of the Apostles, or Apostolical Theophylact.
 Persons. For, as it is granted that Bishops, that Aposto- D. Hammond
 lical Persons, and sometimes that Apostles were then in locum.
 called Presbyters, as appears from St. Peter and St. John ; 1 Pet. 5. 1.
 so might they collectively be called the Presbytery : And 2 John 1.
 then the Sense will run thus, Neglect not the Gift that is
 in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy (according
 to the Revelation of the Spirit concerning thee) at thy
 Ordination ; when besides me, some others also of the
 Apostles laid Hands on thee. And this seems a probable
 Interpretation of the Place, because St. Timothy was Or-
 dained to some Degree of Church Power which the Pres- Pag. 16, supra.
 byters had not, as I have prov'd already. And it is unrea-
 sonable to think, as St. Ambrose expresses it, that an Infe-
 rior should Ordain his Superiour. *Neque enim fas erat, aut* Amb. liv. Hi-
licebat, ut Inferior ordinaret Majorem, nemo enim tribuit quod lafard. in 1
non accepit. So that if this Interpretation be true and va- Tim. 3.
 lid, the Presbyterians have not the least colour for their
 Pretensions.

Secondly, Others interpret this place after a different Hillary, St.
 manner, and, I think, with a greater shew of Reason ; Jerome, Sir
 but by no means favourable to the Presbyterian Cause : Nor. Knatch-
 For they make the Word *Presbytery* to refer not to the Or- bul, in loc.
 dainers, but to the Office ; and then the Words will run
 thus : Neglect not the Work of Presbytery that is in thee, which
 was given thee by Imposition of Hands : And then it agrees ex-
 actly

2 Tim. i. 6.

Instit. lib. 4.
cap. 3, sect. 16.

actly with what the same Apostle says of him in another place, *I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the Gift of God that is in thee, by the putting on of MY HANDS*: And agrees too with the Apostles Practice in other Instances, as that of *Titus* and others: Nay, *Calvin* himself, who was the Founder and great Patron of Presbytery; and who, doubtless, would have used all methods for the support of his Cause, yet could find no colour of reason to understand by the Presbytery, any Company of Presbyters in this place; for he expressly tells us, that it must be understood here, as I have now explain'd it. "I do not so understand it, says he, as if *Paul* did speak of the College of Presbyters; but by this Word I understand the Order it self; as if he had said, Take heed that the Grace which thou receivest by the Imposition of Hands, when I made thee a Presbyter, be not in vain.

But however, because I am willing to grant *J. B.* all I can, with any Truth or Justice, for the support of his Cause, I will suppose, Thirdly, That the Word Presbytery in this place, must really be understood not only of the Ordainers, but likewise of the Inferiour or ordinary Presbytery, and that the Words run thus: *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbyters*, according to the common Acceptation. Now, though this is a Sense in which none of the Fathers ever understood it, that I knew of: yet to satisfy *Mr. B.*, I will grant it; and after all, I cannot see any great Advantage he will gain by it. For he himself tells us, "That the Hands of the Presbytery were joyn'd with *St. Paul's*: And that is as much as I desire at present; for as long as *St. Paul's* Hands were there, as well as those of the Presbytery, it is evident they did not Ordain him by themselves. "Ay, but (says he) they might have done it if they had pleas'd; (And how does *J. B.* know that? "because there would be no just Grounds for the putting their Hands on him, if the Power of Ordination had not belonged to them. That is to say, *St. Paul* called to his Assistance some Inferiour Officers, in this one Instance, for the greater Solemnity of the Action; or, perhaps, to give Countenance to *Timothy's* Youth: Therefore neither he, nor any others, could ever after Ordain without them: Or, which is *Mr. B.*'s Consequence, therefore they could do it

it of *themselves*, without him. Which is so untoward a Conclusion, as I am almost sure Mr. B— himself, upon second thoughts, will not approve of, or justify. There might be several Reasons in that particular Case, why St. Paul might use the Assistance of Presbyters; and yet it cannot follow, that he was obliged to it by his Commission: for it is very probable that he Ordain'd *Titus*, and many others, without any such Assistance.

So that supposing the Assistance of Presbyters in this Case, and that Paul was Chief in the Action: Nay, further suppose, that this was to be a President for After-Ages in their Ordinations, (which is a very large Supposition) yet I cannot see how from this Example *J. B.* or any of his Party, can justly find fault with the Ordinations of our Church, which constantly follows that Example: For not only the Bishop, but the Presbyters that are with him, lay their Hands on the Person that is to be Ordained Presbyter. Therefore I can see no reason why they should *Separate* from us on this account, and exclaim against us as *Unscriptural* and *Degenerate Protestants*, unless they would exclude the Bishop from having any power in it at all, and so make him inferiour to his Presbyters, or at least have such an unlimited Power themselves, as they cannot bring one President for, either in the Apostles times, or many hundred Years after them. Taking it therefore for granted (because *J. B.* nor any of his Party, ever produced any one Instance to the contrary) that some Church-Officers, superiour to Presbyters, always *joyned* in the Ordination; it is from thence evident, First, That there were always some such Superiour Officers, whom they may call Bishops, or Angels, or Messengers, or Apostles, or Evangelists, if they please; or whatever else they think most proper. And Secondly, That the Presbyters themselves could not Ordain without them: And this is all that we at present require. For certainly it is contrary to the Rules of all Government, that whatever subordinate Officers may do with the Concurrence of a Superiour, that they may do the same without it, and against his Injunctions. And yet this is the sorry Reasoning on which this Argument depends, even upon their own Supposition. So that though I should grant to *J. B.* that the Presbyters ought to lay on Hands, yet since

it was never without that Superiour Presbyter whom we call Bishop, it is evident that their Imposition of Hands is not valid, but when in concurrence with the other; at least, when it may be had.

Bennet's Disc.
of Schism, p.
34, 35.

I will beg leave to illustrate this to Mr. B— by a familiar Instance, which has been used before by a Modern Author, on the like occasion. No one doubts but every Justice of Peace may act in many cases, by virtue of his Commission separately, and by himself; in some Cases two are required; and there are other Cases in which no Justice can act, without the Concurrence at least of one of the *Quorum*: So that if any number whatever of Justices of the Peace, though most *Legally Commissioned* by Her Majesty, do presume to act in *such Cases*, without the Concurrence of one of the *Quorum*, their Action is as null and void in Law, as if they never had any *Commission*: And accordingly, though we go upon the largest Supposition, a Supposition against all Antiquity, and grant that Bishops and Presbyters are of the same Order; and that the same Name equally belongs to all of them, as the Order and Name of a Justice belong to all Justices of the Peace; yet there are some things which other Presbyters cannot do, without the Concurrence of the chief Presbyter or Bishop. This has always been believed and acknowledged by the Ancient Fathers of the first and purest Ages of the Church; and I once more desire Mr. B—, or any of his Party, to disprove it, if they can, by any one Text of Scripture, or by any one clear Instance, to the contrary, since the Foundation of Christianity to the end of Six Hundred Years at least. Now therefore, let us put the Case, that in process of time a Man was ordained by some Presbyters, without, and *AGAINST* the Consent, Concurrence or Assistance of their Bishop or chief Presbyter, as it is now daily practised, in such a Case, we must agree with the Primitive Church in all parts of the World; and say that the Orders so confer'd, are utterly null and void. And thus, I think, I have sufficiently proved, that this Text which Mr. B— produces, and which is all the Presbyterians have to depend on, does no Service at all to their Cause, even upon their own Suppositions.

Serm. pag.
425.

As for the other Text which J. B. produces, it is nothing to the purpose, and really is not much insisted on by others
of

of that Parry : But however, because Mr. B— may think he has spy'd something more in it, than others could find out, I will bestow a few Reflections on it : The place is *Acts 13. 1, 2, 3.* where Mr. B— says, " We read of the Teachers, as well as Prophets, concurring to set apart *Acts 13. 1, 2, 3.* Paul and Barnabas, and that by Fasting and Prayer, and Imposition of Hands. — But then still, we must observe, that there were Prophets to give their Concurrence, and that the Teachers did not do it of themselves ; and that is all we desire, at least at this time. But, suppose that those Prophets and Teachers were all mere Presbyters (which is a Concession that J. B. himself is ashamed to ask) and performed this Office of themselves, without the Concurrence of any of the Apostles : Yet it must be observ'd that they were inspired Persons, and commanded to do it by the Holy Ghost, *Acts 13. 2.* and if any mere Presbyters can shew the same Commission, or prove that they have such a Command from Heaven, we must allow their Proceedings ; but till then, we must think that their claiming this Power from this Portion of Scripture, is highly presumptuous : And consequently J. B.'s Conclusion must come under this Imputation, when he says, " Those that were empower'd to send them forth in this Solemn Manner to such a Work, could not want a power to Ordain any others to the Office of an ordinary Pastor or Teacher, which themselves were invested with : That is to say, These Presbyters had an extraordinary Command from Heaven to joyn with the Prophets in the Ordination of Paul and Barnabas, therefore every Presbyter, by his Ordinary Commission, may do the same, not only without the Concurrence, but against the Command of their Bishop or Apostle, or Prophet. This is Mr. B—'s Consequence ; and I desire him, and the rest of our Dissenting Brethren, to consider whether these are such Arguments as will justify their Separation from the Establish'd Church, either to God, or to their own Consciences.

But pray, says Mr. B—, why should not the same Commission that empowers them to preach the Gospel, empower 'em to commit that Doctrine they preach to Faithful Men, that may instruct others also ? Why, because Christ and his Apostles did not think it convenient, for the very same reason that Christ, after he had given

his Apostles a Commission to preach the Gospel, to Baptize, &c. gave them another Commission after he had risen from the Dead, and was just going to leave the World: As for that place of *St. Matthew*, 28. 20. where *he promises to be with them to the end of the World*, tho' it did empower them to Ordain others, yet it does not empower every ordinary Pastor to do the same, (as *J. B.* affirms) because they themselves could not do it by their first Commission: and that promise signifies no more than the guidance and protection of his Holy Spirit, particularly to every Bishop and Minister of the Gospel in the exercise of that Power and Authority which he gave them, when he said unto

Serm. p. 427. *John. 20. 21. them, as my Father sent me, so send I you.*

Thus having shewn how unconvulsive Mr. B—'s Arguments are, which he brings for Presbytery, I will now consider what he alledges against *Timothy* and *Titus*, who

* Pag. 15, 16, we affirm, (and * I have prov'd) had such a Power given

17. them by the Apostles over the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, as our Bishops now claim from the Gospel. These are the two Instances which the Presbyterians do not know how to get readily over, and therefore they wind and turn, and twist to avoid their force, but all in vain; for notwithstanding all that *J. B.* can say against them, they will, they must have that Authority over Presbyters which our Bishops claim.

Serm. p. 417. First then he tells us, that "*Timothy* and *Titus* were not Bishops, but Evangelists, and not confined to any particular Charge. But still, as I observed before, they were of a higher Rank than Presbyters, and had Authority to do many things, which the Presbyters had not, viz. Ordain, Censure, &c. But suppose the calling them Evangelists, would make any thing for their Cause, and St.

2 Tim. 4. 5. *Paul* does once bid *Timothy* to do the Work of an Evangelist; yet it no where appears that *Titus* was one of that Character. Nay tho' they were *St. Paul's* Assistants, and for a while not fix'd to any particular Charge, yet it does not follow, they never were: And indeed, this is so far from Truth, that the Scripture does not only expressly tell us, that *Timothy* was

1 Tim. 1. 3. left at *Ephesus*, and *Titus* at *Crete*, but all Antiquity does

Tit. 1. 5. confirm it, which constantly calls them the first Bishops of those places; and in the Council of *Chalcedon*, 27. Bishops are said to have succeeded in the Chair of *Ephesus* from

from *Timothy*, who was the first: So that as the late learned Bishop of *Worcester* has observed, "They who go about to Unbishop *Timothy* and *Titus*, may as well Unscripture the Epistles that were written to them, and make them only some occasional Writings, as they make *Timothy* and *Titus* to have been particular and occasional Officers: But the Christian Church preserving these Epistles as of constant and perpetual use, did thereby suppose the same kind of Officers to continue, for the sake whereof these excellent Epistles were written: And we have no greater assurance that these Epistles were written by *St. Paul*, than we have that there were Bishops to succeed the Apostles, in the care and government of Churches.

Dut. and Rights of Par-
Cler. p. 111.

So that tho' the Apostles left no Successors, *in eodem gradu*, as to those things that were extraordinary in them, as the extent of their Power in general, &c. yet it does not therefore follow, that they appointed none to have the rule and government of Others: And tho' our Bishops, "have their Authority limited and bounded within certain Precincts, beyond which they pretend not to exert it; as Mr. B— expresses it, yet they may for all this be said to be Successors to the Apostles, with the greatest propriety: They may have the same sort of Power and Authority, though not the same Latitude to exert it in, for the avoiding of Disorder and Confusion; as manifestly appears in all Civil Governments, where a Kingdom which was governed by one single Person, may be shared among two or more Successors, who may have the same kind of Jurisdiction, tho' not of the same Extent.

Serm. p. 418.

Now, tho' I have sufficiently shewed the weakness of this Argument against the *Episcopacy* of *Timothy* and *Titus*; yet (because it is the only thing that either Mr. B— or any of that Party bring against them, I will insist a little longer upon it; for they all tell us, that *Timothy* and *Titus* cannot be brought as a *Precedent* for future Ages, because they, as well as the Apostles, were extraordinary Persons, and, as such, their Power was only *Temporary*; and to last no longer than the Days of the Apostles.

But I would fain ask these Gentlemen, how they come to know this? For we do not read in Scripture, that Christ, or his Apostles, any where limited this Power, or made it *Temporary*: We read indeed, that Christ promised to be
with

with the Apostles to the end of the World: Which could not be understood of their own Persons, because they dyed soon after: But by this, he promised to be present with, and assist all those who succeeded them in their Office and Commission.

But besides, If these Persons were but *Temporary*, and not designed for fix'd Governours of the Church, or *Examples* for the Government of the Church in future Ages; It looks very strange that all Antiquity should be so much mistaken, as to give us a particular account, who succeeded them in their several Churches: It is very strange that we should find in *Eusebius*, and many other Ecclesiastical Writers, such an exact Catalogue, of those particular Persons who Succeeded *Timothy* and *Titus*, if they never had any such Successours: It is certainly a very strange and unaccountable thing, that such a grand Mistake and Imposition should pass for truth, for so many Ages, and not be discovered in the space of 1500 Years: And it is still more strange, that any reasonable Creature should believe it to be a Mistake, on the bare Assertion of a few Men, who, in these two latter Ages of the Church, have started so strange a Notion to countenance them in their Schism, a Notion so contradictory to all matter of Fact, without the least colour or shadow of a Proof for it.

Serm. p. 429. But Mr. B— thinks that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not fixed Bishops of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, because they were constant Companions to *St. Paul* in all his Travels; and so did not reside on their respective Charges. And to prove this, he tells us, he will give us from Scripture a short Abstract of their Travels; but he should rather have said, from *Sme-thymus*, than from Scripture.

Thus he proves from the *Acts of the Apostles* (as he thinks) that *Timothy* could not be the fixed Bishop of *Ephesus*, because we constantly read that he was *St. Paul's* Companion in all his Travels into *Athens*, *Macedonia*, *Jerusalem* and *Rome*.

Now therefore, granting what he hath said concerning *Timothy's* accompanying *St. Paul* in every particular; I cannot see what Service it will do him; for it only proves that *St. Paul* did not leave him at *Ephesus*, till after his being the first time at *Rome*, and the *Acts of the Apostles* reach no further: But does it follow, that *Timothy* was never left at *Ephesus*, because there is no Account given of it in the *Acts* of

of the Apostles, when we are told by St. Paul that he was ; when both his Epistles to him suppose him in Ephesus ; and when all Antiquity says, he was the first Bishop there ?

The only difficulty is, whether St. Paul was twice at Rome or not : But this is put past all doubt by Bishop Pearson, who proves, even to a Demonstration, that Paul was successively twice a Prisoner at Rome. And if there was no other, this one Observation would make it manifest, viz. St. Paul's in his second Epistle to Timothy, which was certainly wrote from Rome when he was in Bonds, tells him, that he had left Trophimus sick at Miletum. But now it is plain, that in his first Journey to Rome, he did not leave Trophimus at Miletum at all, but carried him along with him ; for we are told, that Trophimus was seen at Jerusalem with him, when he was on his Journey towards Rome. So that the Truth of St. Paul's History is, that after his Deliverance at Rome the first time, he makes a Visit to those Churches which he had planted, and settled fixed Governors in them ; and then returns to Rome, where he shuts up his Ministry with his Death.

In this last Journey, which was about the Year of Christ 64, after Paul and Timothy had been in Crete, they Sail from thence into Judea ; from whence they come again into Asia, where Timothy, by St. Paul's Orders, goes to Ephesus, but St. Paul to Colosse, where he design'd to stay for some time. And St. Paul going again into Macedonia, bids Timothy abide at Ephesus ; and there he staid without once removing from thence, but when St. Paul sent for him to Rome, a little before his Martyrdom : From thence Timothy returned to Ephesus, and did not afterwards remove, that ever we hear of ; for we find he was Martyr'd there. This Account of St. Timothy agrees exactly with what Dr. Mills proves of the time of St. Paul's writing both his first and second Epistles to Timothy ; and fully removes all that Mr. B--- has said against Timothy's being fixed at Ephesus.

The case is much the same with Titus as it was with Timothy ; and all the difficulty arises from supposing that Titus was left at Crete before St. Paul's first Journey to Rome : For Bishop Pearson, in the place before quoted, proves that St. Paul never saw Crete, till after his first Imprisonment at Rome ; and therefore we cannot expect any Account of

De serie & successu. primorum Romanæ Episcop. pag. 80, 81, 82.

2 Tim. 4. 20.

Acts 21. 29.

Vid. D. Cave's Lives of the prim. Fathers pag. 51, 52.

Millij prolegomen. in novum testam. pag. 15.

it from the *Acts of the Apostles*, the History whereof reaches no further than *St. Paul's* first going to *Rome*; But this we are sure of from *St. Paul* himself, that he left *Titus* at *Crete*, to set in Order the Things that were wanting, and Ordain Elders in every City; and *Dr. Cave* has proved that he died there. As for all the Objections that *Mr. B—* brings out of *Smectymnus*, who copied the Account from *Lud. Capellus*, the Reader may see them fully answered by *Bishop Pearson*. But taking all they say for granted, I cannot see how it can Unbishop *Titus*, when all Antiquity places him in *Crete*, and reckons him the first Bishop of that Island: And *St. Chrysostom*, as he is quoted by *Dr. Cave*, gives this as the reason why, of all his Disciples and Followers, *St. Paul* wrote Epistles to *Titus* and *Timothy*, and not to *Silas* or *Luke*; because he had committed to them the Care and Government of Churches, while he reserved the others as Attendants and Ministers to go along with himself. So that though we grant, that they were Non-Resident for some time, upon some extraordinary Occasions, it looks very severe for *Mr. B—* to Unbishop them on that Account, when all Antiquity is against him: As severe as he himself would take it, if any one should deny his being a fix'd Preacher in *Wood-street*, because he has been more than once a Non-Resident, and absent from his Cure.

Titus 1. 5.

Cave's Lives
of the prim.
Fathers, pag.
62, 63.

*Chrysost. Ar-
gumen. in 1
Tim.*

Ser. n. p. 432.

But after all, suppose we should be mistaken in this Argument, and that *Dr. Whitby* should be in the right, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not fixed in *Crete* and *Ephesus* for Life, but were sent thither only to fix and form the Government of the Churches there, and then leave them; I can see no great Benefit that will accrue to the Presbyterian Cause by it, for then they were sent to Ordain an Order of Men Superiour to the Presbyters, who might govern and preside, and Ordain others when they were gone, as the same *Dr. Whitby* has proved, not only in that Preface which *Mr. B—* quotes, but in several other places of his Comments on those Epistles. So that whether they were fixed Governours in those places, or whether they were sent to ordain and constitute such fixed Governours, it is the same thing to us; for either of them intirely destroys *Mr. B—'s* Notion of Presbyterian Parity.

But *J. B.* says again, "that there is no Evidence in Holy Scriptures, of the Apostles having left any Officers

“cers superiour to those Scriptural Bishops [*i. e.* Presby-
 “ters] entrusted with the sole power of Church-Govern-
 “ment over some score or hundreds of particular Church-
 “es, and with the sole power of Ordination within that
 “Compass and District: For, says he, such a sole power
 “of Church-Government and Ordination, neither the A-
 “postles nor Evangelists ever claimed themselves, much
 “less did they delegate it to any others, as their Succes-
 “sors therein.

But herein Mr. B— contradicts both the Scriptures and
 all Antiquity: As for the Scriptures, I have all along proved
 from them the contrary to this Assertion; and the
 seven Angels of the seven Churches of *Asia*, and *Timothy*
 and *Titus*, are standing Evidences of the Falshood of
 Mr. B—'s Position; for *Ephesus*, and that part of *Asia* over
 which *Timothy* presided, had several Churches in it; and
Crete, over which *Titus* was Superintendant, was so large,
 that it was called of old *Hecatampolis*, the Island of an hun-
 dred Cities; and *Titus* was left there to ordain Elders in
 every City: And of consequence, *Titus* had so many
 Churches under his Care and Pastoral Authority.

But *J. B.* thinks, “that the Apostles were so far from Serm. p. 433.
 “claiming any such Authority themselves, that they com-
 “mitted it entirely to the Elders. — But surely they could
 not entrust the Elders with it, unless they had claimed it
 themselves before. “Thus, says he, when *St. Paul* sent
 “for the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*, he com-
 “mitted the whole Authority, not to *Timothy*, or any o-
 “ther Superiour Officer, but to themselves: And this, he
 “thinks, is plainly proved, because he bids them *feed the*
 “*Church of Christ*, *i. e.* (as he Interprets it) Rule it.

Now, besides what I have answer'd to this already, I Pa. 24, 25, sup.
 further add, that this is no Argument at all, that *Timothy*
 was not invested with the Supreme Government of the
 Church; or had Directions, at least, to constitute such
 Superiour Governours there: For I would ask Mr. B—,
 could not the Apostle exhort the Elders of the Church to
 do their Duty in their several Stations, without making
 them Rulers and Governours, and giving them power to
 Ordain, Censure, &c. Could they not *Feed the Flock*, *i. e.*
 Instruct them, unless they might also exercise Supreme
 Jurisdiction over them? “Ay, but this was his last Charge,

“ when he tells them, *He shall see their Face no more*: And what
 “ then? Why then this was the proper time, if he de-
 “ sign’d any such thing, to entrust the Government of the
 “ Church with some-body after his Decease. But surely St.
 Paul knew best what was the most proper time for this mat-
 ter: And if he did not see it so proper, as *J. B.* fancies,
 I do not know who can call him to an Account for it,
 especially when we are sure that he left *Timothy* there;
 though the time when, is doubted by some.

Serm. pag.
 434. 435.

“ But then nothing can be more unaccountable, he
 “ says, if he design’d to leave him entrusted with this sole
 “ Government, than that he should not take the least no-
 “ tice of him, nor require those Elders to be subject to
 “ his Authority and Jurisdiction. — Nor in his Epistles to
 “ *Timothy* and *Titus*, describe their Office, and the extent
 “ of it; but confound their Names with the Elders that
 “ are supposed to be their Subjects. And that the Apo-
 “ stles did not design to subject the Elders of *Ephesus* to *Ti-*
 “ *mothy*’s Government is plain, because he bids them take
 “ heed to themselves (or to one another, *αὐτοῖς*) as well
 “ as to the Flock of God.

Now to all this I answer, that it may as well be thought
 unaccountable, why our Blessed Saviour did not order his
 Seventy Disciples to be subject to the Apostles, as that
 St. Paul did not command the Elders of *Ephesus* to be par-
 ticularly obedient to their Bishop. The reason of both is
 plain, because the Rule and Authority of those whom our
 Saviour was to leave in his stead, was so evident from his
 second Mission of them, that there was no need of such
 Directions: And so it was in respect of those whom they
 constituted Governours in their stead. Since therefore,
Timothy was left at *Ephesus* in St. Paul’s stead, they knew
 they were to give him the same Obedience in all things as
 they gave to the Apostle; and of consequence, there was
 no need of such particular Instructions.

“ But is it not strange, that in his Epistles to *Timothy* and
 “ *Titus*, he should never take notice of the Office and Ex-
 “ tent of such Bishops, if he had designed that *Timothy*
 “ and *Titus* should be such Governours?

In Answer to this we say, First, That writing to *Time-*
thy and *Titus*, it was no way requisite that the Apostle
 should write of any more than of the Choice and Qualifi-
 cations

cations of those who were to be Ordained ; and that, because the necessary Qualifications in all Church-Officers are much the same ; and he that performs the Office of a Presbyter well, is qualified for the higher Order ; whenever he is called to it : But after all, is it any consequence ? The Office of these Supreme Governours is not particularly described, therefore there are no such Officers ? St. Paul in his Epistle to *Titus*, mentions no more than the Qualifications of a Presbyter ; does it therefore follow that he would have no Deacons in *Crete* ? This is so slight a way of Reasoning, as must argue a great Weakness either in Mr. B—, or his Cause, when he is guilty of it.

But after all, Secondly, these Supreme Officers who were to succeed *Timothy* and *Titus*, are not forgotten, nor left without a Rule of their particular Duties ; the Office and Extent of it too, is as minutely distinguished, as that of Presbyters : For *Timothy* and *Titus*, and in them all Supreme Spiritual Governours of the Church, are commanded to Rule and Govern, to Censure and Ordain : They are commanded to lay Hands suddenly on no Man, but to try before-hand whether they be qualified for so great an Office : To do nothing partially, to rebuke publicly ; not to receive an Accusation against an Elder under two or three Witnesses, &c. So that we find Mr. B— is mistaken as well in matter of Fact, as in his Consequences.

“ But are not the Elders bid to take heed to themselves, or to one another, as well as to the Flock of Christ ? and does not that invest them with Supreme Authority ? The only Answer I shall bestow on this Argument, shall be by asking *J. B.* another Question of the like nature : Are not all Men commanded to exhort and rebuke one another, and to take care of themselves ? Must all Men therefore be Ministers and Ruling Officers in the Church of God ? Suppose one of the Apostles were now alive, and should write an Epistle to the Church of *Ireland*, wherein he commanded every Minister of the Gospel to take heed to themselves, and to the Flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers ; would that immediately make every Presbyter of the Church equal to his Bishop ? The Case is so plain, and the Arguing so weak, that it needs no Application.

His Argument from St. Peter's requiring the Elders to

Pag. 31, 32,
33, &c.

feed the Flock of God, is of the same Stamp with the former, and requires no further Answer: And his Instances concerning Presbyters ordaining Presbyters, *viz.* the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, and the Teachers joyning with the Prophets of Antioch, in laying their Hands on Barnabas and Saul, I have fully answer'd them already. Upon the whole therefore, I think I may very justly invert Mr. B—'s Conclusion, with a very little Alteration, "If the Apostles themselves claim'd the sole power of Ordination, and delegated the same Power to other fixed Officers; we are sure that others may claim it likewise: And the Presbyters have all the reason in the World to abandon that Power which belongs not to their Office, as Ministers of Christ, and Inspectors of their particular Flocks, because it is a most Unscriptural Claim.

Walo. Messa-
li, pag. 7.

Serm. P. 437.

For the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters is so evident, that the Presbyterians themselves can't but confess its great Antiquity; and *Salmatius*, a fierce Adversary against Episcopacy, was forced to acknowledge, that there was a real Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters in the most Ancient Ages of the Church, excepting only the very times of the Apostles: And *J. B.* confesses much the same, *viz.* "That some Superiority of a Bishop over Presbyters began early after the Apostles Days, and did UNIVERSALLY diffuse it self through the Christian Church. And if so, then was it in all Ages of the Church: For I have prov'd, and they can't deny, that the Apostles challenged a Superiority themselves during their own time; and they own that the Bishops had it in all Ages after; which, I think, is Evidence enough, against the Presbyterian Parity.

Serm. p. 438.

Serm. p. 439.

As for what Mr. B— says of the difference of the Superiority of those Days from what it is now, it is without any Proof: and therefore I shall refer what I have to say upon it, till he proves out of the Primitive Fathers, that the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters was never generally esteemed as a Superiority of Order and Office; but owes its Original to Human Institution. This, he says, he can prove; but I dare say, he never will attempt it.

If the Presbyterian Equality be of Divine Extraction, why don't they shew some time when it was practiced, and how it came to be abolished? They confess, it did not last any longer

longer than till about 30 or 40 Years after the Apostles : So that if their Presbytery was Apostolical, the whole Catholick Church would be found, as it were, in a *joynt Conspiracy*, so early, to have disobey'd and swerved from the Apostles Orders, and that too without any Resistance or Complaint of any one Church or Person that we hear of; which can never be credited by any rational Creature. If that sort of Government had been constituted by Christ and his Apostles, it must follow either that there was a great proneness in the whole Christian Church to rebel against their Lord; or that Christ left such a Form of Church-Government, as was *uncapable* of preserving it self: For, as Doctor *Maurice* has taken notice on this occasion, Vindic. of the Prim. Chur. pag. 368.
 " If the Presbyterian Parity had any place in the Primitive Time, as some do imagine, it must needs have been
 " an intolerable kind of Government, since all of a sudden it was *Universally* abolished: It must have given
 " strange occasion of Offence, when all the Christian Churches of the World should conspire to abrogate this
 " Polity, and destroy all the Memory and Footsteps of
 " it: So that in the lamentable Distractions which the Church fell into afterwards under Bishops, none should
 " so much as propose this way of Relief, by returning to their Ancient Government: This, indeed, is a thing never to be accounted for, if the Presbyterian Government of the Church was founded by Christ and his Apostles; and I would desire our Dissenting Brethren, seriously to consider it: For we may certainly challenge all our Adversaries to shew a time when there was a Church in any part of the World, that was not governed by Bishops, till *Farel* and *Fruementius* drove out their Bishop from *Geneva*, about 200 Years ago. Therefore, when *J. B.* desires that his " Scriptural Bishops, as he calls the Presbyters, be left in the possession of that power of governing their own Flocks, which the Apostles themselves invested them in: We readily grant his Petition, but then must desire him to be satisfied with that, and not to enroach upon his Superiours Authority. Serm. p. 439.

Ay, but he tells us, that " the power of Bishops over Presbyters renders true Church Discipline an impracticable thing. But how he makes that out, he does not tell us, and I confess I do not understand: But, indeed, the

Vid. Rub. to
the Order for
the Admini-
stration of the
Lord's Sup-
per.

the Insinuation is wholly false and groundless ; for the Presbyters in the Episcopal Church have as great power in Ecclesiastical Matters, as ever they had in the Primitive Church : And whoever makes this Objection, must be very ignorant of our Constitution ; for any Presbyter may refuse the Communion to notorious Sinners, which is called a Penitential Excommunication, and is really all the Discipline that is requisite. But allowing we did want Discipline, perhaps the chief Cause of it is their Unchristian Schism ; so that the Objection is so far from being any Mitigation, that it rather aggravates their unwarrantable Separation.

I know Mr. B— insinuates something about the Corruption of Bishops Courts ; and we confess, that by the Covetousness of Proctors and Advocates, there are some Abuses in them, which cannot be redressed without quarrelling with the Civil Magistrate, who gave them that Power ; but does that therefore render Church-Discipline impracticable ? By no means : Nay, some things which they call Corruptions, are really none, but the great Bulwarks of our Church. So that when they say they *cannot* submit to the present Constitution ; their meaning is, they *will not*, unless they may turn the whole Primitive Government of the Church of Christ topsy-turvy, have the whole power of Ordination, Censuring, &c. and every Presbyter be invested with Supreme Ecclesiastical Power ; as is plain from the 440th and 441st Pages, of Mr. B—'s Sermons. This is their Design, this their Ambition ; but we may, we must, answer *J. B.* in his own Language :

Serm. p. 441.

“ That for those whom no less will satisfy than the sole
“ power of Government and Ordination, &c. we think
“ our selves very excusable, that we dare not put down
“ the necessary Government of so many true Scriptural
“ Bishops, for the unnecessary Grandeur and Ambition of
“ these Unscriptural Ones.

So that from what has been said, I am sure Mr. B— has no reason to complain of the Terms of Communion imposed upon every Minister ; for if what I have here offer'd, be true, there can be no difficulty in the Subscriptions and Declarations which are required ; and it may justly be wonder'd at, how those Men should now become so very full of Scruples, who could so easily digest the

* Judi Univ.
Oxon. de So-
lemni Liga &
Federe.

* Solemn
League

League and Covenant, which has been prov'd to be unjust and unlawful.

And thus I think I have answer'd all that is material in Mr. B---'s Sermon against Bishops : For what he speaks of the Foreign Protestant Churches, signifies nothing to his purpose, because their Case is not the same with our Dissenters here. For I suppose Mr. B--- will own there is some difference between those who lay under a necessity of wanting that Form of Church Government, the loss whereof they heartily lament ; and those who *may have it*, but *despise it*.

I have therefore no more to add, but a few Words to the Lay-part of our Dissenting Brethren ; which is to desire them once more to consider whether it is probable or likely ; nay, whether it is possible that this Form of Church-Government by Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, should gain such early Footing in the Church of Christ, as the Dissenting Ministers own it did, and spread *UNIVERSALLY* over the whole Christian World in less than Forty Years after the Apostles, without any one Complaint of its *Usurpation*, if it were not of an Heavenly Extraction ? Or at least, supposing *Presbytery* to have been *Established*, as they say it was, whether it must not have been an intolerable sort of Government, which was by the *joynt Consent* of the whole World, laid down in so short a time ? And then I would have every one of our Dissenting Brethren, seriously to lay it to their Consciences, and ask themselves how they can justify a Separation from the Church *Established*, which is grounded on so absurd a Foundation as the Presbyterian Equality ? How they can answer it ei- to God, or to themselves, to reject that Form of Church-Government which (as I hope I have prov'd) was *Established* by Christ, and put in Practice by the Apostles ; which they themselves confess, was planted in the Church of Christ *UNIVERSALLY* very soon after the Apostles, and so continued for 1500 Years : To reject, I say, such a Government, only to gratify the Humour of some perverse and obstinate Men, whose Interest it is to keep up the Division.

I would desire you, my Brethren, to consider the Cause of Episcopacy without Passion or Partiality ; and to think it no Disgrace to forsake an Error into which some of
your

your Forefathers have been seduced by designing Men. It would desire you, not immediately to hearken to every thing that is laid to our Charge by some hot Men, whose unbridled Passion for the Cause of Presbytery, betrays more Ignorance than true Zeal: And therefore they let loose their Tongues at all Adventures, and load the Government of our Church with the opprobrious Names of Superstition, Popery, &c. only to abuse the Common People, and cast an Odium on that Form of Government which checks their Ambitious Designs, and which for this Reason, they would willingly destroy.

For after all their Heat and Zeal, if the Matter be narrowly canvass'd, we shall find that Presbytery, rather than Episcopacy, is a Relict of Popery; which has always less'n'd the Episcopal Authority, in order to raise the Power of the Papacy: And therefore it has been affirmed by some of their School-Divines and Canonists, that the Pope may grant a Commission to a Clergy-man, to confer such Orders as he himself has, viz. that a Priest, by such Commission, may ordain a Priest, and a Deacon ordain a Deacon. Take away but the Pope's Commission, says a Judicious Modern Author, and here is true Presbyterian Ordination left as a Relict of Popery. And it is observed by the Lord Bishop of Sarum, that the Establishing of Episcopacy, as founded on a Divine Right, was look'd upon at Trent, as one of the fatallest Blows that could have been given to the Papacy.

I would therefore have none of our Dissenting Brethren run the least hazard in any respect, nor be impos'd on, by the Dirt which is thrown on Episcopacy by some hot, designing Men: But, as an Ambassador for Christ, I beseech them to return to that Communion, wherein they are sure to have all the Sacraments rightly and duly Administred by Men who are lawfully Call'd and Commission'd, even according to the Confession of their own Teachers. I shall add no more, but pray that God would open all our Eyes, and guide us in the right Way, the Way of Salvation.

An Account
of Chur. Go-
vernment and
Governours,
pag. 92.
Hist. of the
Reform. abr.
lib. I. p. 207.

F I N I S.



